

Removal of UV cutoff for the Nelson model with variable coefficients

C. Gérard¹, F. Hiroshima², A. Panati³, and A. Suzuki⁴

¹Département de Mathématiques, Université de Paris XI, 91405 Orsay
Cedex France

²Faculty of Mathematics, University of Kyushu, 6-10-1, Hakozaki, Fukuoka,
812-8581, Japan

³UMR6207 Université Toulon-Var 83957 La Garde Cedex France

⁴ Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Engineering, Shinshu University,
4-17-1 Wakasato, Nagano 380-8553, Japan

July 20, 2011

Abstract

We consider the Nelson model with variable coefficients. Nelson models with variable coefficients arise when one replaces in the usual Nelson model the flat Minkowski metric by a static metric, allowing also the boson mass to depend on position. We study the removal of the ultraviolet cutoff.

1 The Nelson Hamiltonian with variable coefficients

1.1 Introduction

The Nelson model [Ne] describes a spinless nonrelativistic particle linearly coupled to a scalar bose field. After adding an ultraviolet (UV) cutoff, this model can be defined as a self-adjoint operator on some Hilbert space. In [Ne], E. Nelson was able to remove the UV cutoff and to define the Hamiltonian as a self-adjoint operator without UV cutoff on the original Hilbert space.

We extend the Nelson model to the case with variable coefficients, which realizes the Nelson model defined on a static Lorentzian manifold. In a series of papers [GHPS1,

AMS 2010 *Subject Classification*. 81T10, 81T20, 81Q10, 58C40

Key words and phrases. Nelson model, static space-times, ground state, ultraviolet limit

GHPS2, GHPS3], we show the existence or absence of ground states of the variable coefficients Nelson model $H(\rho)$ with a certain UV cutoff ρ . In this paper we consider the removal of UV cutoff for variable coefficients Nelson models. Denoting by H^κ the Nelson Hamiltonian $H(\rho^\kappa)$ for the cutoff function $\rho^\kappa(x) = \kappa^3 \rho(\kappa x)$, we construct a particle potential $E^\kappa(X)$ such that $H^\kappa - E^\kappa(X)$ converge in strong resolvent sense to a bounded below selfadjoint operator H^∞ . The removal of the UV cutoff involves as in the constant coefficients case a sequence of unitary dressing operators U^κ . In contrary to the constant coefficients case, where all computations can be conveniently done in momentum space (after conjugation by Fourier transform), we have to use instead *pseudodifferential calculus*. Some of the rather advanced facts on pseudodifferential calculus which we will need are recalled in Appendix A.

1.2 Notation

We collect here some notation for reader's convenience.

We denote by $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ (resp. $X \in \mathbb{R}^3$) the boson (resp. electron) position. As usual we set $D_x = i^{-1} \nabla_x$, $D_X = i^{-1} \nabla_X$. If $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we set $\langle x \rangle = (1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The domain of a linear operator A on some Hilbert space will be denoted by $\text{Dom} A$, and its spectrum by $\sigma(A)$. If $\mathfrak{h}$ is a Hilbert space, the *bosonic Fock space* over $\mathfrak{h}$ denoted by $\Gamma_s(\mathfrak{h})$ is

$$\Gamma_s(\mathfrak{h}) = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} \otimes_s^n \mathfrak{h}.$$

We denote by $a^*(h)$ and $a(h)$ for $h \in \mathfrak{h}$ the creation operator and the annihilation operator, respectively, which acts on $\Gamma_s(\mathfrak{h})$. The (Segal) *field operators* $\phi(h)$ are defined as

$$(1.1) \quad \phi(h) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a^*(h) + a(h)).$$

If $\mathcal{K}$ is another Hilbert space and $v \in B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathfrak{h})$, one defines the operators $a^*(v)$ and $a(v)$ as unbounded operators on $\mathcal{K} \otimes \Gamma_s(\mathfrak{h})$ by

$$\begin{aligned} a^*(v) \Big|_{\mathcal{K} \otimes \otimes_s^n \mathfrak{h}} &= \sqrt{n+1} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}} \otimes \mathcal{S}_{n+1} \right) \left(v \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\otimes_s^n \mathfrak{h}} \right), \\ a(v) &= \left(a^*(v) \right)^*, \\ \phi(v) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a^*(v) + a(v)). \end{aligned}$$

If b is a selfadjoint operator on $\mathfrak{h}$ its second quantization $d\Gamma(b)$ is defined as

$$d\Gamma(b) \Big|_{\otimes_s^n \mathfrak{h}} = \sum_{j=1}^n \underbrace{\mathbb{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{1}}_{j-1} \otimes b \otimes \underbrace{\mathbb{1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{1}}_{n-j}.$$

The number operator N is defined by the second quantization of the identity operator $\mathbb{1}$:

$$N = d\Gamma(\mathbb{1}).$$

The annihilation operator and the creation operator satisfy the estimate:

$$(1.2) \quad \|a^\sharp(v)(N+1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\| \leq \|v\|,$$

where $\|v\|$ is the norm of v in $B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathfrak{h})$.

1.3 Field Hamiltonian

Let

$$h_0 = - \sum_{1 \leq j, k \leq d} c(x)^{-1} \partial_j a^{jk}(x) \partial_k c(x)^{-1},$$

$$h = h_0 + m^2(x),$$

with a^{jk} , c , m are real functions and

$$(B) \quad \begin{aligned} C_0 \mathbb{1} &\leq [a^{jk}(x)] \leq C_1 \mathbb{1}, \quad C_0 \leq c(x) \leq C_1, \quad C_0 > 0, \\ \partial_x^\alpha a^{jk}(x) &\in O(\langle x \rangle^{-1}), \quad |\alpha| \leq 1, \\ \partial_x^\alpha c(x) &\in O(1), \quad |\alpha| \leq 2, \\ \partial_x^\alpha m(x) &\in O(1), \quad |\alpha| \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly h is selfadjoint on $H^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $h \geq 0$. The one-particle space is given by

$$\mathfrak{h} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, dx)$$

and one-particle energy by the selfadjoint operator:

$$\omega = h^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

It can be easily seen that

$$(1) \quad \text{Ker } \omega = \{0\}.$$

$$(2) \quad \text{Assume in addition to (B) that } \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} m(x) = 0. \text{ Then } \inf \sigma(\omega) = 0.$$

The field Hamiltonian is

$$d\Gamma(\omega),$$

acting on the bosonic Fock space $\Gamma_s(\mathfrak{h})$.

1.4 Electron Hamiltonian

We define the electron Hamiltonian as

$$K = K_0 + W(X),$$

where

$$K_0 = \sum_{1 \leq j, k \leq 3} D_{X_j} A^{jk}(X) D_{X_k},$$

acting on $\mathcal{K} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, dX)$, and

$$(E) \quad C_0 \mathbb{1} \leq [A^{jk}(X)] \leq C_1 \mathbb{1}, \quad C_0 > 0.$$

We assume that $W(X)$ is a real potential such that $K_0 + W$ is essentially selfadjoint and bounded below. We denote by K the closure of $K_0 + W$.

1.5 Nelson Hamiltonian with variable coefficients

The constant

$$m = \inf \sigma(\omega) \geq 0$$

can be viewed as the *mass* of the scalar bosons. The Nelson Hamiltonian defined below will be called *massive* (resp. *massless*) if $m > 0$ (resp. $m = 0$). Let $\rho \in S(\mathbb{R}^3)$, with $\rho \geq 0$, $q = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho(y) dy \neq 0$. We set

$$\rho_X(x) = \rho(x - X)$$

and define the UV cutoff scalar bose fields as

$$(1.3) \quad \varphi_\rho(X) = \phi(\omega^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_X),$$

where $\phi(f)$ is the Segal field operator. The *Nelson Hamiltonian* with UV cutoff ρ is given by

$$(1.4) \quad H(\rho) = K \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes d\Gamma(\omega) + \varphi_\rho(X),$$

acting on the Hilbert space:

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{K} \otimes \Gamma_s(\mathfrak{h}).$$

Set also

$$H_0 = K \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes d\Gamma(\omega),$$

which is selfadjoint on its natural domain. Moreover assume hypotheses (E) and (B). Then H is selfadjoint and bounded below on $D(H_0)$.

2 Removal of the UV cutoff

2.1 Nelson Hamiltonians with constant coefficients

In [Ne] Nelson considered the limit of $H(\rho)$ for

$$(2.1) \quad \omega = \omega(D_x) = (-\Delta_x + m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad m \geq 0,$$

$$(2.2) \quad K = -\frac{1}{2} \Delta_X + W(X),$$

when ρ tends to the Dirac mass δ , equivalently, the Fourier transform $\hat{\rho}$ to $(2\pi)^{-3/2}$.

We quickly review the results in [Ne]. In the rest of this subsection we take the momentum representation for the field variables. Let H_{Stand} be the constant coefficients Nelson model defined by $H(\rho)$ with (2.1) and (2.2). Suppose $m = 0$ and $\hat{\rho}_\Lambda(k) = 1$ for $|k| < \Lambda$ and $\hat{\rho}_\Lambda(k) = 0$ otherwise. We denote by H_Λ the Hamiltonian H_{Stand} with $\hat{\rho}$ replaced by $\hat{\rho}_\Lambda$. Let

$$(2.3) \quad \hat{T}(k) = \omega(k) + |k|^2/2$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad E_\Lambda = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \omega(k)^{-1} \chi(\omega(k) > \sigma) \hat{T}(k)^{-1} |\hat{\rho}_\Lambda|(k)^2 dk,$$

where $\sigma > 0$ is arbitrary and $\chi(\omega(k) > \sigma)$ is an IR cutoff function given by $\chi(\omega(k) > \sigma) = 0$ for $\omega(k) < \sigma$ and 1 for $\omega(k) \geq \sigma$. Define the dressing transformation by

$$(2.5) \quad U_\Lambda = e^{i\phi(i\beta_X)},$$

where

$$(2.6) \quad \beta_X(k) = -\hat{T}(k)^{-1} \chi(\omega(k) > \sigma) \omega(k)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-ikX} \hat{\rho}_\Lambda(k).$$

It is easy to see that $U_\Lambda \rightarrow U_\infty$ strongly as $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$, where U_∞ is given by U_Λ with $\hat{\rho}_\Lambda$ replaced by 1. Instead of H_Λ , Nelson considers the dressing-transformed Hamiltonian:

$$(2.7) \quad \widehat{H}_\Lambda = U_\Lambda H_\Lambda U_\Lambda^*.$$

Proposition 2.1 [Ne] *There exists a bounded below self-adjoint operator H_∞ such that $\widehat{H}_\Lambda - E_\Lambda$ converges to H_∞ as $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ in the uniform resolvent sense, and $H_\Lambda - E_\Lambda$ to $U_\infty^* H_\infty U_\infty$ in the strong resolvent sense.*

Remark 2.2 Nelson [Ne] actually considered only the case of $m > 0$. It can be however extended to the case of $m = 0$.

In this section we study the same problem for the Nelson model with variable coefficients.

2.2 Preparations

In the constant coefficients Nelson model, the one-particle operator ω is diagonalized using the Fourier transform. In the variable coefficients Nelson Hamiltonian we will use instead the pseudodifferential calculus to define operators and constants corresponding to (2.4), (2.5), (2.6) and (2.7). In particular the renormalization constant E_Λ will be changed to a function $E(X)$.

We denote by $S^0(\mathbb{R}^3)$ the space

$$S^0(\mathbb{R}^3) = \{f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3) \mid |\partial_x^\alpha f(x)| \leq C_\alpha, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^3\}.$$

We will assume in addition to hypotheses (E) and (B) that

$$(N) \quad A_{jk}(X), \quad a_{jk}(x), \quad c(x), \quad m^2(x) \in S^0(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

It is easy to see that h can be rewritten as

$$h = \sum_{jk} D_j c^{-2}(x) a^{jk}(x) D_j + v(x),$$

where $v \in S^0(\mathbb{R}^3)$, and that $c^{-2}(x) a^{jk}(x) \in S^0(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Changing notation, we will henceforth assume that

$$h = \sum_{jk} D_j a^{jk}(x) D_j + v(x),$$

where $[a_{jk}](x)$ satisfies (B) and $a^{jk}, v \in S^0(\mathbb{R}^3)$. We refer the reader to Appendix A for the notation and for some background on pseudodifferential calculus. It will be useful later to consider $\omega = h^{\frac{1}{2}}$ as a pseudodifferential operator. Note first that

$$h = h^w(x, D_x),$$

for

$$h(x, \xi) = \sum_{1 \leq j, k \leq 3} \xi_j a^{jk}(x) \xi_k + c(x).$$

The symbol $h(x, \xi)$ belongs to $S(\langle \xi \rangle^2, g)$, for the standard metric

$$g = dx^2 + \langle \xi \rangle^{-2} d\xi^2,$$

and is elliptic in this class. By Lemma A.1 and Theorem A.3, we know that if $f \in S^p(\mathbb{R})$, then the operator $f(h)$ belongs to $\Psi^w(\langle \xi \rangle^{2p}, g)$.

If the model is massive, then picking a function $f \in S^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R})$ equal to $\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in $\{\lambda \geq m/2\}$, we see that $\omega = f(h) \in \Psi^w(\langle \xi \rangle, g)$. If the model is massless, we fix $\sigma > 0$ ($\sigma = 1$ will do) and pick $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$f(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } |\lambda| \geq 4\sigma^2, \\ \sigma & \text{if } |\lambda| \leq \sigma^2. \end{cases}$$

We set

$$\omega_\sigma = f(h).$$

Again by Theorem A.3 we know that ω_σ belongs to $\Psi^w(\langle \xi \rangle, g)$. In the massive case $\omega = f(h)$ will also be denoted by ω_σ . Consider now the operator

$$T = K_0 \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes \omega_\sigma,$$

acting on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, dX) \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, dx)$. Clearly T is selfadjoint on its natural domain and $T \geq \sigma$.

Lemma 2.3 *Set*

$$M(\Xi, \xi) = \langle \Xi \rangle^2 + \langle \xi \rangle, \quad G = dX^2 + dx^2 + \langle \Xi \rangle^{-2} d\Xi^2 + \langle \xi \rangle^{-2} d\xi^2.$$

Then T^{-1} belongs to $\Psi^w(M^{-1}, G)$.

Proof. By Lemma A.2, the metric G and weight M satisfy all the conditions in Subsect. A.1. Clearly $T \in \Psi^w(M, G)$. We pick a function $f \in S^{-1}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $f(\lambda) = \lambda^{-1}$ in $\{\lambda \geq \sigma/2\}$. By Theorem A.3 $T^{-1} = f(T) \in \Psi^w(M^{-1}, G)$. $\square$

Let us fix another cutoff function $F(\lambda \geq \sigma) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with

$$F(\lambda \geq \sigma) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } |\lambda| \geq 4\sigma, \\ 0 & \text{for } |\lambda| \leq 2\sigma, \end{cases}$$

and set

$$F(\lambda \leq \sigma) = 1 - F(\lambda \geq \sigma).$$

Lemma 2.4 *Set*

$$\beta(X, x) = \beta_X(x) = -T^{-1}F(\omega \geq \sigma)\omega^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho_X = -T^{-1}F(\omega \geq \sigma)\omega_\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho_X.$$

Then

$$(1) \quad \beta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^6).$$

(2) Let $0 \leq \alpha < 1$. Then $\omega^\alpha \beta_X \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, dx)$ and there exists $s > 3/2$ such that

$$\|\omega^\alpha \beta_X\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, dx)} \leq C\|\rho\|_{H^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^3)},$$

uniformly in X .

(3) Let $\alpha > 0$. Then $\omega^{-\alpha} \nabla_X \beta_X \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, dx)$ and there exists $s > 3/2$ such that

$$\|\omega^{-\alpha} \nabla_X \beta_X\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, dx)} \leq C\|\rho\|_{H^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^3)},$$

uniformly in X .

(4) One has

$$\omega^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho_X + (K_0 \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes \omega)\beta_X = \omega^{-\frac{1}{2}}F(\omega \leq \sigma)\rho_X.$$

Proof. The function $\rho_X(x)$ is clearly C^∞ in (X, x) , so (1) follows from the fact that T^{-1} and $\omega_\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}F(\omega \geq \sigma)$ are pseudodifferential operators.

We claim that there exists a symbol $b_X(x, \xi) = b(X, x, \xi)$ such that

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} b(X, x, \xi) &\in S(\langle \xi \rangle^{-5/2}, dX^2 + dx^2 + \langle \xi \rangle^{-2} d\xi^2), \\ \beta_X &= b_X^{(1,0)}(x, D_x)\rho_X. \end{aligned}$$

Let us prove our claim. Let $B(X, x, \Xi, \xi) \in S(M^{-1}, G)$ be the $(1, 0)$ symbol of T^{-1} . Applying Lemma 2.3 and (A.10), we know that $T^{-1} \in \Psi^{(1,0)}(M^{-1}, G)$. Setting $w(X, x) = T^{-1}\rho_X$, this yields

$$\begin{aligned} w(X, x) &= (2\pi)^{-3} \int e^{i(X \cdot \Xi + x \cdot \xi)} B(X, x, \Xi, \xi) \delta(\xi + \Xi) \hat{\rho}(\xi) d\xi d\Xi \\ (2.9) \quad &= (2\pi)^{-3} \int e^{i(x-X) \cdot \xi} B(X, x, -\xi, \xi) \hat{\rho}(\xi) d\xi \\ &= b_X^{(1,0)}(x, D_x) \rho_X \end{aligned}$$

for

$$(2.10) \quad b_X(x, \xi) = B(X, x, -\xi, \xi).$$

This implies that

$$b_X \in S(\langle \xi \rangle^{-2}, dX^2 + dx^2 + \langle \xi \rangle^{-2} d\xi^2).$$

Applying once again Theorem A.3, we know that $F(\omega \geq \sigma) \omega_\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \in \Psi^{(1,0)}(\langle \xi \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}}, g)$. By the composition property (A.11), we obtain our claim.

(2) follows from (2.8), if we note that $\omega^\alpha F(\omega \geq \sigma) \omega_\sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \in \Psi^{(1,0)}(\langle \xi \rangle^{\alpha-\frac{1}{2}}, g)$ and use the mapping property of pseudodifferential operators between Sobolev spaces recalled in (A.13). (3) is proved similarly, using that

$$\nabla_X b_X(x, D_x) \rho_X = \partial_X b_X(x, D_x) \rho_X - b_X(x, D_x) \nabla_x \rho_X.$$

Finally (4) follows from the fact that $(\omega - \omega_\sigma) F(\omega \geq \sigma) = 0$. $\square$

2.3 Dressing transformation

Let ρ be a charge density as above. We set for $\kappa \gg 1$

$$\rho^\kappa(x) = \kappa^3 \rho(\kappa x), \quad \rho_X^\kappa(x) = \rho^\kappa(x - X),$$

so that

$$(2.11) \quad \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \infty} \rho_X^\kappa = q \delta_X \text{ in } H^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^3), \quad \forall s > 3/2,$$

where $q = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho(y) dy$. This implies

$$(2.12) \quad \|\rho_X^\kappa\|_{H^{-s}(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq C, \text{ uniformly in } X, \kappa, \text{ for all } s > 3/2.$$

We set

$$H^\kappa = H(\rho^\kappa),$$

and as in [Ne]

$$U^\kappa = e^{i\phi(i\beta_X^\kappa)},$$

which is a unitary operator on $\mathcal{H}$. (Recall that β_X^κ is defined in Lemma 2.4).

Proposition 2.5 *Set*

$$\begin{aligned}
a_j^\kappa(X) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}a(\nabla_{X_j}\beta_X^\kappa), \\
R^\kappa &= 2\sum_{j,k}\nabla_{X_j}A_{jk}(X)a_k^\kappa(X) - a_j^{\kappa*}(X)A_{jk}(X)\nabla_{X_k} \\
&\quad + \sum_{j,k}2a_j^{\kappa*}(X)A_{jk}(X)a_k^\kappa(X) - a_j^{\kappa*}(X)A_{jk}(X)a_k^{\kappa*}(X) - a_j^\kappa(X)A_{jk}(X)a_k^\kappa(X), \\
V^\kappa(X) &= -(\rho_X^\kappa|\omega^{-1}F(\omega \geq \sigma)T^{-1}\rho_X^\kappa) + \frac{1}{2}(T^{-1}\rho_X^\kappa|F^2(\omega \geq \sigma)T^{-1}\rho_X^\kappa) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{jk}A_{jk}(X)(\nabla_{X_j}T^{-1}\rho_X^\kappa|\omega^{-1}F^2(\omega \geq \sigma)\nabla_{X_k}T^{-1}\rho_X^\kappa).
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
U^\kappa H^\kappa U^{\kappa*} &= K + d\Gamma(\omega) + \phi(\omega^{-\frac{1}{2}}F(\omega \leq \sigma)\rho_X^\kappa) \\
&\quad + R^\kappa + V^\kappa(X).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We recall some well-known identities

$$(2.13) \quad U^\kappa(d\Gamma(\omega) + \phi(\omega^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho_{\kappa,X}))U^{\kappa*} = d\Gamma(\omega) + \phi(\omega\beta_X^\kappa + \omega^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho_X^\kappa) + \text{Re}(\frac{\omega}{2}\beta_X^\kappa + \omega^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho_X^\kappa|\beta_X^\kappa).$$

Note that the scalar product in the rhs is real valued, since ρ_X^κ , β_X^κ and ω are real vectors and operators. Using once more that β_X^κ is real, we see that the operators $\phi(i\beta_X^\kappa)$ for different X commute, which yields

$$U_\kappa D_{X_j} U^{\kappa*} = D_{X_j} - \phi(i\nabla_{X_j}\beta_X^\kappa),$$

and hence

$$U^\kappa K U^{\kappa*} = \sum_{j,k} (D_{X_j} - \phi(i\nabla_{X_j}\beta_X^\kappa)) A_{jk}(X) (D_{X_k} - \phi(i\nabla_{X_k}\beta_X^\kappa)) + W(X).$$

We expand the squares in the r.h.s. using the definition of $a_j^\kappa(X)$ in the proposition. After rearranging the various terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
U^\kappa K U^{\kappa*} &= K + \phi(K_0\beta_X^\kappa) \\
&\quad + 2\sum_{j,k}\nabla_{X_j}A_{jk}(X)a_k^\kappa(X) - a_j^{\kappa*}(X)A_{jk}(X)\nabla_{X_k} \\
&\quad + \sum_{j,k}2a_j^{\kappa*}(X)A_{jk}(X)a_k^\kappa(X) - a_j^{\kappa*}(X)A_{jk}(X)a_k^{\kappa*}(X) - a_j^\kappa(X)A_{jk}(X)a_k^\kappa(X) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{jk}A_{jk}(X)(\nabla_{X_j}\beta_X^\kappa|\nabla_{X_k}\beta_X^\kappa).
\end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned}
U^\kappa H^\kappa U^{\kappa*} &= K + d\Gamma(\omega) \\
&\quad + 2\sum_{j,k}\nabla_{X_j}A_{jk}(X)a_k^\kappa(X) - a_j^{\kappa*}(X)A_{jk}(X)\nabla_{X_k} \\
&\quad + \sum_{j,k}2a_j^{\kappa*}(X)A_{jk}(X)a_k^\kappa(X) - a_j^{\kappa*}(X)A_{jk}(X)a_k^{\kappa*}(X) - a_j^\kappa(X)A_{jk}(X)a_k^\kappa(X) \\
&\quad + \phi(\omega^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho_X^\kappa + (K_0 + \omega)\beta_X^\kappa) \\
&\quad + (\omega^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rho_X^\kappa + \frac{1}{2}\omega\beta_X^\kappa|\beta_X^\kappa) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{jk}A_{jk}(X)(\nabla_{X_j}\beta_X^\kappa|\nabla_{X_k}\beta_X^\kappa).
\end{aligned}$$

The sum of the second and third lines equals R^κ . By Lemma 2.4, the fourth line equals $\phi(\omega^{-\frac{1}{2}}F(\omega \leq \sigma)\rho_X)$. The fifth line equals $V^\kappa(X)$, using the definition of β_X . $\square$

2.4 Removal of the ultraviolet cutoff

Set

$$h_0(x, \xi) = \sum_{1 \leq j, k \leq 3} \xi_j a_{jk}(x) \xi_k, \quad K(X, \xi) = \sum_{1 \leq j, k \leq 3} \xi_j A_{jk}(X) \xi_k.$$

and

$$(2.14) \quad E^\kappa(X) = -\frac{1}{2}(2\pi)^{-3} \int (h_0(X, \xi) + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} K(X, \xi) (K(X, \xi) + 1)^{-2} |\hat{\rho}|^2 (\xi \kappa^{-1}) d\xi.$$

Lemma 2.6 *Then there exists a bounded continuous potential V_{ren} such that*

$$\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow +\infty} V^\kappa(X) - E^\kappa(X) = V_{\text{ren}}(X),$$

in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

We will prove this lemma later. We are in the position to state the main theorem.

Theorem 2.7 *Assume hypotheses (E), (B), (N). Then the family of selfadjoint operators*

$$H^\kappa - E^\kappa(X)$$

converges in strong resolvent sense to a bounded below selfadjoint operator H^∞ .

Proof. By Prop. 2.8 below, $U^\kappa(H^\kappa - E^\kappa(X))U^{\kappa*}$ converges in norm resolvent sense to $\hat{H}^\infty$. Moreover by Lemma 2.4 (2), β_X^κ converges in $B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathfrak{h})$ when $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$, hence U^κ converges strongly to some unitary operator U^∞ . It follows that H^κ converges in strong resolvent sense to

$$H^\infty = U^{\infty*} \hat{H}^\infty U^\infty. \quad \square$$

Proof of Lemma 2.6. For simplicity we will assume that the model is massive ($m > 0$), which allows to remove the cutoffs $F(\omega \geq \sigma)$ in the various formulas. The massless case can be treated similarly. Recall that

$$(2.15) \quad \begin{aligned} T^{-1} \rho_X^\kappa &= b_X(x, D_x) \rho_X^\kappa, \\ \partial_X T^{-1} \rho_X^\kappa &= \partial_X b_X(x, D_x) \rho_X^\kappa - b_X(x, D_x) \partial_x \rho_X^\kappa, \end{aligned}$$

where $b_X(x, \xi)$ is defined in (2.10). Plugging the second identity in (2.15) into the formula giving $V_\kappa(X)$ we get

$$V^\kappa(X) = V_1^\kappa(X) + V_2^\kappa(X),$$

for

$$\begin{aligned} V_1^\kappa(X) &= \frac{1}{2} \|b_X(x, D_x) \rho_X^\kappa\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{jk} A_{jk}(X) (\partial_{X_j} b_X(x, D_x) \rho_X^\kappa | \omega^{-1} \partial_{X_k} b_X(x, D_x) \rho_X^\kappa) \\ &\quad - \sum_{jk} A_{jk}(X) (\partial_{X_j} b_X(x, D_x) \rho_X^\kappa | \omega^{-1} b_X(x, D_x) \partial_{x_k} \rho_X^\kappa), \\ V_2^\kappa(X) &= -(\rho_X^\kappa | \omega^{-1} b_X(x, D_x) \rho_X^\kappa) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{jk} A_{jk}(X) (b_X(x, D_x) \partial_{x_j} \rho_X^\kappa | \omega^{-1} b_X(x, D_x) \partial_{x_k} \rho_X^\kappa). \end{aligned}$$

We will use that

$$(2.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho_X^\kappa &\rightarrow q\delta_X \text{ in } H^s(\mathbb{R}^3), \quad \forall s < -\frac{3}{2}, \\ \partial_x \rho_X^\kappa &\rightarrow q\partial_x \delta_X \text{ in } H^s(\mathbb{R}^3), \quad \forall s < -\frac{5}{2}, \text{ uniformly in } X \in \mathbb{R}^3, \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that $q = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho(y) dy$. Using that $b_X(x, \xi) \in S(\langle \xi \rangle^{-2}, g)$ and the mapping properties of pseudodifferential operators between Sobolev spaces, we obtain that

$$\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \infty} V_1^\kappa(X) = V_1^\infty(X) \text{ exists uniformly for } X \in \mathbb{R}^3,$$

and $V_1^\infty(X)$ is a bounded continuous function, whose exact expression is obtained by replacing ρ_X^κ by $q\delta_X$ in the formula giving $V_1^\kappa(X)$.

We now consider the potential $V_2^\kappa(X)$, which will be seen to be logarithmically divergent when $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$. To extract its divergent part, we use symbolic calculus. We will use only the $(1, 0)$ quantization and omit the corresponding superscript. We first use Prop. A.4 for the metric G defined in Lemma 2.3. Note that the ‘Planck constant’ for the metric G is

$$\lambda(X, x, \Xi, \xi) = \min(\langle \Xi \rangle, \langle \xi \rangle).$$

Applying Prop. A.4, we obtain that the symbol $b_X(x, \xi)$ in (2.9) equals

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} b_X(x, \xi) &= (K(X, \xi) + (h_0(x, \xi) + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-1} + S(\langle \xi \rangle^{-3}, g) \\ &= (K(X, \xi) + 1)^{-1} + S(\langle \xi \rangle^{-3}, g). \end{aligned}$$

The same argument for the metric g shows that $\omega^{-1} = d(x, D_x)$ for

$$(2.18) \quad d(x, \xi) = (h_0(x, \xi) + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + S(\langle \xi \rangle^{-2}, g).$$

Combining (2.17) and (2.18) we get that

$$(2.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \omega^{-1} b_X(x, D_x) &= c_X(x, D_x) + r_X(x, D_x), \\ b_X^*(x, D_x) \omega^{-1} b_X(x, D_x) &= d_X(x, D_x) + s_X(x, D_x), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(2.20) \quad \begin{aligned} c_X(x, \xi) &= (h_0(x, \xi) + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (K(X, \xi) + 1)^{-1}, \\ d_X(x, \xi) &= (h_0(x, \xi) + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (K(X, \xi) + 1)^{-2}, \\ r_X(x, \xi) &\in S(\langle \xi \rangle^{-4}, g), \quad s_X(x, \xi) \in S(\langle \xi \rangle^{-6}, g), \text{ uniformly in } X \in \mathbb{R}^3. \end{aligned}$$

Setting

$$\tilde{V}_2^\kappa(X) = -(\rho_X^\kappa | c_X(x, D_x) \rho_X^\kappa) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{jk} A_{jk}(X) (\partial_{x_j} \rho_X^\kappa | d_X(x, D_x) \partial_{x_k} \rho_X^\kappa),$$

we see using again (2.16) that

$$(2.21) \quad \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \infty} V_2^\kappa(X) - \tilde{V}_2^\kappa(X) = V_2^\infty(X) \text{ exists uniformly for } X \in \mathbb{R}^3$$

and is a bounded continuous function. The potential $\tilde{V}_2^\kappa(X)$ can be explicitly evaluated. In fact

$$(2.22) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\rho_X^\kappa | c_X(x, D_x) \rho_X^\kappa) \\ &= (2\pi)^{-3} \int e^{i(x-X) \cdot \xi} c_X(x, \xi) \rho_X^\kappa(x) \hat{\rho}(\kappa^{-1}\xi) dx d\xi \\ &= (2\pi)^{-3} \int e^{i(x-X) \cdot \xi} c_X(X, \xi) \rho_X^\kappa(x) \hat{\rho}(\kappa^{-1}\xi) dx d\xi + O(\kappa^{-1}) \log(\kappa) \\ &= (2\pi)^{-3} \int c_X(X, \xi) |\hat{\rho}|^2(\kappa^{-1}\xi) d\xi + O(\kappa^{-1}) \log(\kappa). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$(2.23) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\partial_{x_j} \rho_X^\kappa | d_X(x, D_x) \partial_{x_k} \rho_X^\kappa) \\ &= (2\pi)^{-3} \int e^{i(x-X) \cdot \xi} \partial_j \rho_X^\kappa(x) d_X(x, \xi) i \xi_k \hat{\rho}(\kappa^{-1}\xi) dx d\xi \\ &= (2\pi)^{-3} \int e^{i(x-X) \cdot \xi} \rho_X^\kappa(x) d_X(x, \xi) \xi_j \xi_k \hat{\rho}(\kappa^{-1}\xi) dx d\xi \\ &\quad - (2\pi)^{-3} \int e^{i(x-X) \cdot \xi} \rho_X^\kappa(x) \partial_j d_X(x, \xi) i \xi_k \hat{\rho}(\kappa^{-1}\xi) dx d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

The second term in the rhs has a finite limit when $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$. By the same argument as above, we have

$$(2.24) \quad \begin{aligned} & (2\pi)^{-3} \int e^{i(x-X) \cdot \xi} \rho_X^\kappa(x) d_X(x, \xi) \xi_j \xi_k \hat{\rho}(\kappa^{-1}\xi) dx d\xi \\ &= (2\pi)^{-3} \int e^{i(x-X) \cdot \xi} \rho_X^\kappa(x) d_X(X, \xi) \xi_j \xi_k \hat{\rho}(\kappa^{-1}\xi) dx d\xi + O(\kappa^{-1} \log(\kappa)) \\ &= (2\pi)^{-3} \int d_X(X, \xi) \xi_j \xi_k |\hat{\rho}|^2(\kappa^{-1}\xi) d\xi + O(\kappa^{-1} \log(\kappa)). \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of $c_X(x, \xi)$ and $d_X(x, \xi)$ in (2.20), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & -c_X(X, \xi) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{jk} A_{jk}(X) \xi_j \xi_k d_X(X, \xi) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} (h_0(X, \xi) + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} K(X, \xi) (K(X, \xi) + 1)^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of $E^\kappa(X)$ and (2.22), (2.23) and (2.24) it follows that

$$\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{V}_2^\kappa(X) - E^\kappa(X) \text{ exists uniformly for } X \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Proposition 2.8 *Let*

$$\hat{H}^\kappa = U^\kappa H^\kappa U^{\kappa*} - E^\kappa(X).$$

Then there exists a bounded below selfadjoint operator $\hat{H}^\infty$ such that

- (1) $\hat{H}^\kappa$ converges to $\hat{H}^\infty$ in norm resolvent sense;

$$(2) \ D(|\hat{H}^\infty|^{\frac{1}{2}}) = D(H_0^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Proof. The proof is analogous to the one in [Ne], using Theorem A.6 so we will only sketch it. The important point is the convergence of R^κ as quadratic form on $D(|H_0|^{\frac{1}{2}})$ when $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$. The various terms in R^κ are estimated with the help of Lemma A.5, applied to the coupling operator $v^\kappa = \nabla_{X_j} \beta_X^\kappa$. From Lemma 2.4 (3), we obtain that $\omega^{-\alpha} \nabla_{X_j} \beta_X^\kappa$ converges in $B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathfrak{h})$ when $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$. The only remaining point to consider is the fact that powers of the number operator N appear in Lemma A.5. This is sufficient in the massive case since H_0 dominates N . In the massless case, we use the fact that $\beta_X^\kappa = F(\omega \geq \sigma/2) \beta_X^\kappa$. Therefore if we apply Lemma A.5, we can replace N by $d\Gamma(\mathbb{1}_{[\sigma/2, +\infty[}(\omega))$, which is dominated by H_0 . The rest of the proof is standard. $\square$

A Background on pseudodifferential calculus

In this section we recall various standard results on pseudodifferential calculus that will be needed in the sequel. It is convenient to use the language of the Weyl-Hörmander calculus.

A.1 Symbol classes

We start by recalling the definition of symbol classes and weights. Let g be a Riemannian metric on $\mathbb{R}^d$, i.e. a map

$$g : \mathbb{R}^d \ni X \mapsto g_X,$$

with values in positive definite quadratic forms on $\mathbb{R}^d$. If $M : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow]0, +\infty[$ is a strictly positive function called a *weight*, one denotes by $S(M, g)$ the symbol class of functions in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$|\prod_{i=1}^k (v_i \cdot \nabla_X) a(X)| \leq C_k M(X) \prod_{i=1}^k |g_X(v_i)|^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

uniformly for $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $v_1, \dots, v_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The best constants C_k are seminorms on $S(M, g)$.

Usually $d = 2n$ and one sets $\mathbb{R}^d \ni X = (x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. If

$$(A.1) \quad g_X = dx^2 + \langle \xi \rangle^{-2} d\xi^2$$

and $M(X) = \langle \xi \rangle^m$, the symbol class $S(M, g)$ is the usual symbol class

$$S_{1,0}^m = \{a \mid |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta a(x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha,\beta} \langle \xi \rangle^{m-|\beta|}, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^n\}.$$

For simplicity we will also denote by $S^p(\mathbb{R})$, $p \in \mathbb{R}$, the space

$$(A.2) \quad S^p(\mathbb{R}) = \{f \mid |f^{(k)}(\lambda)| \leq C_k \langle \lambda \rangle^{p-k}, k \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

ie $S^p(\mathbb{R}) = S(\langle \lambda \rangle^p, \langle \lambda \rangle^{-2} d\lambda^2)$.

If one equips $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ with the usual symplectic form σ , one can consider the dual metric g_X^σ . Diagonalising g_X in (linear) symplectic coordinates on $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$, one can write

$$g_X(dx, d\xi) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{dx_i^2}{a_i^2(X)} + \frac{d\xi_i^2}{\alpha_i^2(X)},$$

and

$$g_X^\sigma(dx, d\xi) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2(X) dx_i^2 + a_i^2(X) d\xi_i^2.$$

One introduces also the two functions $\lambda(X)$, $\Lambda(X)$ which are the best functions such that

$$\lambda(X)^2 g_X \leq g_X^\sigma \leq \Lambda(X)^2 g_X,$$

equal to

$$\lambda(X) = \min_i a_i(X) \alpha_i(X), \quad \Lambda(X) = \max_i a_i(X) \alpha_i(X).$$

The function $\lambda(X)$ plays the role of the Planck constant.

One says that g is a *Hörmander metric*, if the following conditions are satisfied

- (1) *uncertainty principle*: $\lambda(X) \geq 1$;
- (2) *slowness*: there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$(A.3) \quad g_Y(X - Y) \leq C^{-1} \Rightarrow (g_Y(\cdot)/g_X(\cdot))^{\pm 1} \leq C;$$

- (3) *temperateness*: there exist $C > 0$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(A.4) \quad (g_Y(\cdot)/g_X(\cdot))^{\pm 1} \leq C (1 + g_Y^\sigma(Y - X))^N.$$

One says that a weight M is *admissible* for g if there exist $C > 0$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(A.5) \quad (M(Y)/M(X))^{\pm 1} \leq \begin{cases} C, & \text{for } g_Y(X - Y) \leq C^{-1}, \\ C(1 + g_Y^\sigma(X - Y))^N, & \text{for } X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}. \end{cases}$$

The metric g is *geodesically temperate* if g is temperate and if there exist $C > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(A.6) \quad (g_Y(\cdot)/g_X(\cdot))^{\pm 1} \leq C(1 + d^\sigma(X, Y))^N,$$

where d^σ is the geodesic distance for the metric g^σ .

The metric g is *strongly slow* if there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$(A.7) \quad g_Y^\sigma(X - Y) \leq C^{-1} \Lambda(Y)^2 \Rightarrow (g_Y(\cdot)/g_X(\cdot))^{\pm 1} \leq C.$$

Lemma A.1 *The metric $dx^2 + \langle \xi \rangle^{-2} d\xi^2$ and weight $\langle \xi \rangle^\alpha$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy all the above conditions.*

Proof. Most conditions are immediate, except the last two. To check (A.6), we note that $d^\sigma(X, Y) \leq |\xi - \eta|$, from which (A.6) follows. (A.7) follows from the fact that $\Lambda(X) = \langle \xi \rangle$. $\square$

Lemma A.2 *Assume that (g_i, M_i) , $i = 1, 2$ are two metrics and weights on $\mathbb{R}^{2n_i}$ satisfying all the above conditions. Then (g, M) on $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ satisfy all the above conditions for $n = n_1 + n_2$ and*

$$g_X(dx) = g_{X_1}(dx_1) + g_{X_2}(dx_2), \quad M(X) = M_1(X_1) + M_2(X_2).$$

A.2 Pseudodifferential calculus

To a symbol $a \in S'(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, one can associate the operator defined by

$$(A.8) \quad a^w(x, D)u(x) = (2\pi)^{-n} \int e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi} a\left(\frac{x+y}{2}, \xi\right) u(y) dy d\xi,$$

called the *Weyl quantization* of a , which is well defined as a bounded operator from $S(\mathbb{R}^n)$ into $S'(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let (g, M) be a metric and weight satisfying (A.3), (A.4), (A.5). We set

$$\Psi^w(M, g) = \{a^w \mid a \in S(M, g)\}.$$

If $a \in S(M, g)$ then a^w sends $S(\mathbb{R}^n)$ into itself. Moreover as quadratic forms on $S(\mathbb{R}^n)$

$$(a^w)^* = \overline{a^w}.$$

One often uses also the $(1, 0)$ quantization defined by

$$(A.9) \quad a^{1,0}(x, D)u(x) = (2\pi)^{-n} \int e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi} a(x, \xi) u(y) dy d\xi.$$

One has with obvious notations

$$(A.10) \quad \Psi^w(M, g) = \Psi^{(1,0)}(M, g).$$

Moreover

$$(A.11) \quad \Psi^\#(M_1, g) \times \Psi^\#(M_2, g) \subset \Psi^\#(M_1 M_2, g),$$

where $\# = w$ or $(1, 0)$ and if $a \in S(M, g)$

$$(A.12) \quad a^w(x, D_x) = b^{(1,0)}(x, D_x), \text{ where } a - b \in S(M\lambda^{-1}, g).$$

Let now g be the standard metric defined in (A.1) and $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the Sobolev space of order $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$(A.13) \quad \Psi^\#(\langle \xi \rangle^p, g) \subset B(H^s(\mathbb{R}^d), H^{s-p}(\mathbb{R}^d)),$$

and the norm of $a^\#$ in $B(H^s(\mathbb{R}^d), H^{s-p}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is controlled by a finite number of seminorms of a in $S(\langle \xi \rangle^p, g)$.

A.3 Functional calculus for pseudodifferential operators

Assume that the weight M satisfies

$$(A.14) \quad M(X) \leq C(1 + \lambda(X))^N, \quad C > 0, \quad N \in \mathbb{N}.$$

A symbol $a \in S(M, g)$ is *elliptic* if

$$(A.15) \quad 1 + |a(X)| \geq C^{-1}M(X).$$

The following theorem is shown in [Bo, Cor. 4.5]

Theorem A.3 *Assume that (M, g) satisfy all the conditions in Subsect. A.1. Assume moreover that $M \geq 1$, $a \in S(M, g)$ is real and elliptic, and a^w is essentially selfadjoint on $S(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then if $f \in S^p(\mathbb{R})$, the operator $f(a^w)$ belongs to $\Psi^w(M^p, g)$.*

The following result can easily be obtained.

Proposition A.4 *Assume the hypotheses of Theorem A.3. Then*

$$f(a^w) - f(a)^w \in \Psi^w(M^p \lambda^{-1}, g),$$

where the function $\lambda(X)$ is defined in Subsect. A.1.

Note that the same result holds for the $(1, 0)$ quantization, thanks to (A.12).

Proof. one first proves the result for $f(\lambda) = (\lambda - z)^{-1}$, $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, which amounts to construct a so-called parametrix for $a^w - z$. From symbolic calculus it follows that if $b_z(x, \xi) = (a(x, \xi) - z)^{-1}$, then $b_z^w(a^w - z) - \mathbb{1} \in \Psi^w(\lambda^{-1}, g)$. To extend the result to arbitrary functions one expresses $f(a^w)$ in terms of $(a^w - z)^{-1}$ using the well known functional calculus formula based on an almost analytic extension of f (see eg [DG, Prop. C.2.2]). $\square$

A.4 Various estimates

The following lemma is proved in [A, Lemma 3.3].

Lemma A.5 *For $s \in [0, 1]$, and $v_i \in B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathfrak{h})$, $i = 1, 2$ we have*

- 1) $\|(N + 1)^{-\frac{s}{2}} a(v_1) (H_0 + 1)^{-\frac{1-s}{2}}\| \leq \|\omega^{\frac{s-1}{2}} v_1\|_{B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathfrak{h})},$
- 2) $\|(H_0 + 1)^{-\frac{s}{2}} a^*(v_1) (N + 1)^{-\frac{1-s}{2}}\| \leq \|\omega^{-\frac{s}{2}} v_1\|_{B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathfrak{h})},$
- 3) $\|(N + 1)^{-s} a(v_1) a(v_2) (H_0 + 1)^{-1+s}\| \leq \|\omega^{-\frac{1-s}{2}} v_1\|_{B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathfrak{h})} \|\omega^{-\frac{1-s}{2}} v_2\|_{B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathfrak{h})},$
- 4) $\|(H_0 + 1)^{-s} a^*(v_1) a^*(v_2) (N + 1)^{-1+s}\| \leq \|\omega^{-\frac{s}{2}} v_1\|_{B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathfrak{h})} \|\omega^{-\frac{s}{2}} v_2\|_{B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathfrak{h})}.$

The following theorem follows from the KLMN theorem and [RS, Theorem VIII.25].

Theorem A.6 *Let H_0 be a positive selfadjoint operator on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Let for $\kappa < \infty$, B_κ be quadratic forms on $D(H_0^{\frac{1}{2}})$ such that*

$$|B_\kappa(\psi, \psi)| \leq a \|H_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\psi\|^2 + b \|\psi\|^2,$$

where $a < 1$ uniformly in κ and $B_\kappa \rightarrow B_\infty$ on $D(H_0^{\frac{1}{2}})$. Then

(1) *there exists a selfadjoint operator H_κ with $D(H_\kappa) \subset D(H_0^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and*

$$(H_\kappa\psi, \psi) = B_\kappa(\psi, \psi) + (H_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\psi, H_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\psi), \quad \psi \in D(H_\kappa) \text{ for } \kappa \leq \infty.$$

(2) *the resolvent $(z - H_\kappa)^{-1}$ converges in norm to $(z - H_\infty)^{-1}$.*

(3) *e^{itH_κ} converges strongly to e^{itH_∞} when $\kappa \rightarrow +\infty$.*

References

- [A] Ammari, Z. Asymptotic completeness for a renormalized nonrelativistic Hamiltonian in quantum field theory the Nelson model, *Math. Phys. Anal. Geom.* **3** (2000), 217-285.
- [Bo] Bony, J. M. Caractérisations des opérateurs pseudodifférentiels, Séminaire EDP, Centre de Mathématiques Laurent Schwartz, 1996-1997.
- [DG] Dereziński, J., Gérard, C. *Scattering Theory of Classical and Quantum N..Particle Systems*, Texts and Monographs in Physics, Springer-Verlag (1997).
- [GHPS1] Gérard, C., Hiroshima, F., Panati, A., Suzuki, A. Infrared divergence of a scalar quantum field model on a pseudo Riemannian manifold, *Interdisciplinary Information Sciences* **15**, (2009) 399-421.
- [GHPS2] Gérard, C., Hiroshima, F., Panati, A., Suzuki, A. Infrared problem for the Nelson model on static space-times, to appear in *Commun. Math. Phys.*
- [GHPS3] Gérard, C., Hiroshima, F., Panati, A., Suzuki, A. Absence of ground state for the Nelson model on static space-times, arXiv:1012.2655 preprint 2011.
- [Ne] Nelson, E. Interaction of nonrelativistic particles with a quantized scalar field, *J. Math. Phys.* **5** (1964), 1190-1997.
- [RS] Reed, M. and Simon, B., *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics Vol. I: Academic Press, New York, 1975.*